DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 678 CG 013 510

AUTHOR Jones, R. Wayne; Blaney, Robert L.
TITLE Psychological Educational Assessment of Juvenile Delinquents. Treatment of Delinquency Series, Chapter 2.
INSTITUTION Wilkes Coll., Wilkes-Barre, Pa. Educational Development Center.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 88p.; For related documents see CG 013 509-518
AVAILABLE FROM Educational Development Center, Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18703

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Adolescents; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Delinquents; *Educational Assessment; *Psychoeducational Processes; *Psychological Evaluation; Socially Deviant Behavior

ABSTRACT

The second part of a 10-part series, this report was compiled by the Educational Development Center at Wilkes College. The series deals with various aspects of the treatment of delinquents and is intended as a summary of research findings in each of the areas treated. Each report was prepared by a scholar-practitioner and is presented in a way that will be of value to professionals who deal both directly and indirectly with the treatment of delinquent youth. The report is, in fact, one manuscript of 627 pages; however, to make it more easily used, it is published in 10 separate parts. A detailed table of contents for the entire series is presented at the end of each part. This part offers practical, readable discussions of a number of tests currently used to predict delinquency or measure various aspects of intellectual development and personality characteristics. Sections on language development, medical and neurological evaluation, and vocational interest pattern assessment are included. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170678

THE TREATMENT OF DELINQUENCY SERIES

AN EDC REPORT

CHAPTER 2

Psychological Educational Assessment of Juvenile Delinquents

R. Wayne Jones

and

Robert L. Blaney

Georgia State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Blaney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WILKES COLLEGE
WILKES-BARRE, PENNSYLVANIA 18703

CG013510

Editor's Preface

This report is part of a ten part series compiled by the Educational Development Center at Wilkes College. The series deals with various aspects of the treatment of delinquents and is intended as a summary of research findings in each of the areas treated. Each report was prepared by a scholar-practitioner and is presented in a way that will be of value to those whose calling has led them to educational careers dealing both directly and indirectly with the treatment of delinquent youth. The report is, in fact, one manuscript of 627 pages: however, to make it more easily used, it is published in ten separate parts. A detailed table of contents for the entire series is presented at the end of this part.

Additional copies of this part as well as other parts of the series are available from the Educational Development Center, Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18703. Permission is granted for bona fide users to reproduce any part of the document. We ask only that the user exert care to preserve the integrity of the document and do justice to the authors by crediting quotations used to the author who prepared the original work.

We invite any and all comments and/or inquiries concerning this series.

Joseph A. Skok, D.P.A.

Director
Educational Development Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 85
Problems in the Prediction of Delinquency 90
Assessment Instrumentation for Predicting Delinquency . . . 97
Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale 97
Validation of Prediction Efforts 100
The Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Checklist and Rating Scale 103
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory 106
Variables in Psychosocial/Educational Assessment 109
Intellectual Capacity 109
Medical and Neurological Evaluation. 112
Language Development 114
Diagnosis of Reading Skills 116
Diagnosis of Mathematical Computation 118
Diagnosis of Spelling Ability. 120
Academic Achievement Levels 121
Study and Organizational Skills Evaluation 124
Personality Assessment 126
California Psychological Inventory 129
The California Life Goals Evaluation Schedules 131
The California Test of Personality: A Profile of Personal and Social Adjustment. 132
A Two-Step Process for Identifying Emotionally Handicapped Pupils 133
The Ego Ideal and Conscience Development Test (EICDT) 135
Behavior Cards: A Test Interview for Delinquent Children 136
The Hostility and Direction of Hostility Questionnaire (HDHQ) 137
The Hand Test 138
Self-Concept. 140
Vocational Interest Pattern Assessment 142
Summary 146
References 147

CHAPTER II

PSYCHOSOCIAL/EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

R. Wayne Jones and Robert L. Blaney

INTRODUCTION

Correctional facilities for juveniles have typically been more effective in labeling chronically disruptive youth as unworthy than they have been in providing these individuals with alternative paths conducive to finding acceptable life styles. The public assumes that correctional facilities for juveniles will be effective in altering an individual so that upon his return to society he will be less likely to have conflict with established laws. A review of the effectiveness of these institutions in meeting this expectation, however, strongly suggests that juvenile delinquent facilities, as adult penal facilities, are excessively expensive and, moreover, are exceptionally ineffective. The current Governor of California, Edmund G. Brown, Jr., has stated that these institutions "don't rehabilitate, they don't deter, they don't punish, they don't protect." (1975) Almost everyone now connected with criminal justice systems, including lawyers,

judges, criminologists, correctional officials, and even the inmates themselves are acknowledging openly that rehabilitation in prison does not work for most. It is estimated that the United States spends approximately one billion dollars a year to confine and correct two hundred and twenty thousand convicted offenders in state and federal prisons. At least half of these offenders return to these or similar facilities in neighboring states after their release.

If the purpose of juvenile correctional facilities is, in part, the rehabilitation of delinquents, then the specification of an appropriate treatment program becomes a critical factor. Such treatment programs should emphasize the development of effective coping skills which are consistent with the demands of society. An adequate self-concept has been hypothesized as one important factor in the development of effective coping skills and appropriate adult roles in society (Brookover, 1967). Treatment goals in correctional facilities should take the form of realistic feedback to improve an individual's self-concept rather than to enhance feelings of inadequacy.

Unfortunately, most institutions for juvenile delinquents do not have highly individualized treatment regimes. Generally speaking, they provide an educational program apart from or as part of a clinical treatment program. The educational program is usually based upon a standard state-approved curriculum. And herein lies a dilemma. A number of studies (Farls, 1967; and Jones & Strowig, 1968) have suggested education to be the single most important factor affecting the

development of self-concept. But, while most correctional facilities do provide some sort of educational program, that program is based upon a standard curriculum that is typically the very source of academic difficulty for the male delinquent (Sabatino, Mauser, & Skok, 1975).

The educational programs available in correctional facilities for juvenile offenders have a potential for providing the basis for effective individualized treatment regimes. But, if such programs are to be effective in reaching state treatment goals, important modifications must be made. For example, it is essential that for each individual the appropriate entry level in all subject matters (especially reading, math computation, and spelling) be specified. No student can be expected to succeed at instructional levels that are incongruous with his current levels of ability. In addition, careful attention should be given to the student's learning rate, as well as to other individual strengths and weaknesses in learning. The most effective means for obtaining the information necessary for the development of an appropriate individualized educational program would be by psychosocial/educational evaluation. Adequate psychosocial/educational assessment can, at the very least, delineate an individual's present level of ability in school content areas and predict learning rate and potential intellectual capacity.

Effective clinical treatment programs should be based upon the information collected by a comprehensive psychosocial/educational

assessment of norm-violating youths. The constraints of time and lack of fully qualified personnel may make the implementation of all of the following suggestions difficult. However, comprehensive psychosocial/educational evaluation during the initial period of adjudication could make programs for delinquents significantly more instrumental in producing positive behavior change.

The purpose of psychosocial/educational diagnosis is to describe the learning and behavioral characteristics of each youth. The type of diagnostic information obtained on incoming adjudicated delinquents will vary from one institutional facility to another. However, almost all institutional facilities have some type of intake procedures. This is particularly true for the majority of correctional centers across the United States containing some aspects of an educational program. However, the specific procedures which characterize intake assessments have been shown to be exceptionally variable (Sabatino, Mauser, & Skok, 1975). If intake diagnostic and assessment procedures of either a psychological or psychoeducational nature are to be meaningful, they must lead to alternative routes for treatment and/or education. In addition, all the collected data should provide predictive information on the age-old problem of recidivism.

Neither the courts nor the majority of treatment centers for adjudicated delinquents have fully qualified professional staff. The number of qualified penal psychiatrists is small. Ph. D. -level psychologists working on more than a consultative basis to the majority

of facilities are exceptionally rare (Meninger, 1968). The staffs of most facilities lack social workers or similarly trained personnel who can collect family and environmental histories. The majority of facilities rely upon Masters-level counselors or psychologists to conduct intake interviews, record histories, assess court transcripts, and conduct the initial psychosocial/psychoeducational assessment.

If delinquent incarceration is viewed as purely punishment, then there is no valid or logical reason for psychosocial/educational assessment. However, if treatment philosophy prevails as the main purpose of incarceration, headlining the major mission of preparing the individual to take an appropriate societal role upon return to his original environment, such assessment becomes vital. Evaluation of a variety of variables and/or deficit states which may have led the individual into the original conflict with societal norms and the resultant conviction and loss of civil liberties is essential then. Psychosocial evaluation should provide the correctional facility staff responsible for adjudicated delinquents with information that will effectively present assignments of an individual to (1) more appropriate and effective treatment regimes, including choice of psychotherapeutic technique, milieu variables, and peer associates; and (2) the selection of an appropriate educational entry level for school placement, including a precise and detailed evaluation of possible areas for remediation, including the degree to which curriculum and instruction must be individualized.

Without question, there remains focused interest on the development of valid predictors of delinquency to permit early preventive efforts. There also exist focused demands for effective treatment of adjudicated delinquents. The following sections will review research pertinent to prediction of delinquency and a model for psychosocial/educational assessment.

Problems in the Prediction of Delinquency

The difficulty in specifying the exact nature of juvenile delinquency has caused a number of problems in the development of instruments for the assessment, diagnosis, and prediction of delinquency. Any definition of delinquency is necessarily contextual in nature. A commonly held definition states the phenomenon to be the commission of repeated acts of a kind which, when committed by persons beyond the statutory juvenile court age of 16, are punishable as crimes (either felonies or misdemeanors). Such a definition is premised upon legal factors, and such factors usually vary from community to community depending upon the social norms and attitudes of that community. Thus, an offense which might designate a particular youth to be delinquent in one community may, in fact, not be considered a criminal offense in another. It is frequently a youth's failure to comply with a unique set of social norms that determines

juvenile delinquency. Factors involved may change from situation to situation. Thus, because of sociocultural variability in defining juvenile delinquency, the specification of unique personality traits associated with juvenile delinquency is a difficult, if not impossible, problem.

McDavid (1968, 1974) suggests that crime and delinquency may be viewed as two sorts of behaviors: asocial behavior and antisocial behavior. Asocial behavior refers to an individual's inability to control those impulses toward certain behaviors that arise from relatively normal motivation. Although such behavior is unacceptable socially, it is most likely the result of an individual's failure to learn acceptable socially defined behaviors. The behavior itself cannot be viewed as a direct and purposeful attack upon society. Rather, the individual simply fails to learn to monitor his behavior through the inhibition of socially unacceptable acts.

Antisocial behavior, on the other hand, represents a purposeful and direct attack upon society. There is a premeditated, intentional factor in antisocial behavior that is absent in asocial behavior. Both asocial and antisocial behaviors may be serious socially unacceptable behaviors. Violent aggressive behavior can provide an example of the distinction between these two types of behaviors. Feelings of aggression may generally be considered to be a normal consequence of frustration. The socialization process encourages the inhibition of relatively normal aggressive impulses through socially acceptable

releases, for example, football, boxing, etc. When this socialization process fails to control the aggressive behavior of a particular individual, the individual may respond to aggressive impulses in a socially unacceptable manner. Although socially unacceptable behavior may take a number of expressive forms, it cannot be inferred that this behavior represents an intentional attack upon society. Excessive aggressive behavior may simply represent the failure of the socialization process to instill appropriate outlets for difficult-to-explain feelings. This failure of the individual to control or inhibit such impulses would be appropriately referred to as asocial behavior.

On the other hand, the individual who experiences frustration and consequently sees himself as a victim of society's interference with his own personal objectives may be impelled to attack society directly. Such behavior would take the form of carefully planned crimes such as forgery, extortion, or premeditated assault. Asocial behavior is typically seen in the senselessness of many adolescent crimes such as the theft of small amounts of money, the theft of an auto for a brief joy ride rather than its resale, or pointless vandalism.

Although the various crimes committed by juvenile delinquents are both antisocial and asocial, according to the distinction specified by McDavid, the greatest number of these crimes would seem to belong to the category of asocial behavior. It is interesting to note, however, that although most juvenile delinquents are initially adjudicated for what might be termed a senseless, asocial crime, many of

these youths become repeated offenders and subsequent crimes are of a decidedly antisocial nature. That is to say, a youth arrested for a relatively petty offense may well be later arrested for far more serious and premeditated crimes.

Considerable research has been undertaken in recent years to develop instruments useful in predicting juvenile delinquency. The reasoning behind such research has been the need for a method of identifying and treating the potential delinquent. Such reasoning is, indeed, sound; there could be no better deterrent to juvenile delinquency than the ability to detect those youths who evidence a high probability of delinquent behavior before such behavior occurs. Unfortunately, those instruments available have, to date, proven to be far from successful in identifying the potential delinquent. For a number of reasons, the development of an assessment instrument capable of predicting juvenile delinquency has proven difficult. Some of these reasons characterize the development of any standardized predictive instrument.

The development of an instrument to predict delinquency is based upon the notion that a configuration of personality traits is common to most juvenile delinquents. Thus, the basic problems in the development of a predictive instrument are first, the specification of the nature of those unique traits; and secondly, the development of effective techniques for measuring those particular traits. In addition, there are problems associated with the development of an instrument

which can be administered effectively and economically to the appropriate populations. Furthermore, the validation of such an instrument would be difficult but critical. These problems have all contributed to hindering or retarding the development of a valid and reliable instrument effective in the prediction of juvenile delinquency.

The preventative value of any prognostic instrument is determined largely by the age at which predictions can be made and by the accuracy of these predictions. In addition, problems exist concerning the age at which accurate predictions can be successfully ascertained. If an instrument is to be an effective predictor, then there should be no appearance of critical etiological factors after the assessment has been undertaken.

The accuracy of any predictive instrument is dependent upon a number of factors. Because delinquency is typically an adolescent phenomenon, the problem arises as to when it is possible to detect or assess those traits which indicate a propensity toward delinquency. A prediction must be based upon the nature of some trait which is relatively stable at the time it is measured and which remains stable as the subject matures. The identification of these traits and the assessment procedures have proven uniquely difficult problems for the production of an instrument predicting delinquency.

The classic Social Prediction Scale developed by the Gluecks (1950) claims that the instrument may be administered as early as age 6. The suggestion that an analysis of the interpersonal family

relationships at age 6 can accurately predict adolescent behavior patterns is highly questionable. It is difficult to believe that significant factors within the family cannot change appreciable in the six or so years before adolescence. Other writers, such as Reckless, Denitz, and Kay (1957), argue that age 12 is the earliest age at which a reasonable prediction may be made about future adolescent behavior. Their selection of age 12 is based upon a number of factors. It is the age commonly considered to be the beginning of adolescence and, thus, to be the threshold age for official delinquency. That is to say, before this age, few cases are ever resolved in court. At age 12, children generally enter junior high or high schools in most American cities. Early adolescence is also generally considered to be the time of life when young people begin to verbalize about themselves and effectively utilize self-expression and self-reporting instruments. The literature on delinquency generally indicates that research is rarely conducted on subject populations younger than age 10.

The accuracy of any predictive instrument is dependent upon the size of the sample upon which it is validated, as well as the specific population components of that sample. That is to say, ethnic and racial composition of the normative population must also be considered and given special attention in an instrument produced to predict delinquency. A review of the literature on assessment instruments in this field indicates that most standardization procedures have failed to

utilize a reasonable population sample for norming their predictive instruments.

Perhaps the most severe criticism of those instruments which have been developed and used in predicting delinquency is the critical need for empirical validation of their predictive ability. Unfortunately, the techniques employed to validate them have retrospectively failed to consider the ability of such measures to discriminate between identified populations of delinquent and nondelinquent youths. It is essential, however, that prospective application be given to different, independent samples in order to properly evaluate the instrument's ability to predict delinquency. A number of specific validation studies have been undertaken in the past fifteen years which should be exampled for their influence on present thinking. Before reviewing these studies, however, a more detailed discussion of those predictive instruments available should be undertaken.

Despite the difficulties associated with their construction, a number of assessment instruments for predicting juvenile delinquency are available. Some of the instruments have been designed with this specific purpose in mind. Other techniques capable of assessing prosocial and antisocial behavior have proven amenable, in varying degress, of predicting potential delinquency.

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTATION FOR PREDICTING DELINQUENCY

The following section discusses those instruments which have been used to predict juvenile delinquency. Three instruments--the Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale, the Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Scale, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory--have been used in extensive longitudinal predictive research studies. Other instruments which are discussed hold potential predictive ability and/or have use in understanding adjudicated youth.

Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale

It would be worthwhile to first examine the Gluecks' Juvenile Delinquency Scale because of the important contribution made by these researchers to the literature on juvenile delinquency. The Gluecks initially designed three scales for predictive purposes. The first of these scales was a scale of interpersonal family factors, later known as the Social Prediction Scale. The second was a scale of character structure traits which was based upon a projective technique, the Rorschach InkBlot Test. The third scale dealt with temperament traits which were determined as the result of a psychiatric interview. The development of these three predictive scales was based upon those factors which were found to discriminate sharply between 500 delinquents and 500 nondelinquents. The three scales which were initially

developed by the Gluecks were later abridged to one, the Social Prediction Scale. It has been the Social Prediction Scale which has undergone intensive and long-term evaluation.

The nature of this Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale requires factual and observed data on five subtest variables to be obtained by trained home interviewers. The interviews recorded the following five subtest variables:

1. discipline of the boy by his father,
2. supervision of the boy by his mother,
3. affection of the father for the boy,
4. affection of the mother for the boy,
5. cohesiveness of the family unit.

The initial validation study on the prediction of delinquency utilizing the Social Prediction Scale was obtained on a sample of 224 boys who were entering the first grade in the school year 1952-1953. This sample was later increased by the addition of another 76 boys. A comprehensive followup study of all the boys in this evaluation provided the criterion data on this particular instrument.

The initial five-factor scale has been reduced to a two-factor and a three-factor scale. The three-factor scale includes: 1) discipline of the boy by his father, 2) supervision of the boy by his mother, and a measure of 3) family cohesiveness. The two-factor scale retains only supervision of the boy by his mother and a measure of family cohesiveness. It is suggested by the investigators that these two instruments are more refined than the earlier five-factor scale.

After nine years of study and evaluation, the Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale has evidenced moderately good predictability between potential delinquents and nondelinquents. Validity data accumulated over the nine years indicate that the three-factor scale obtains 70% accuracy in predicting delinquency and 85% accuracy in predicting nondelinquency.

Despite the fairly high degree of accuracy with which the Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale has predicted delinquency and nondelinquency, a number of criticisms have been raised concerning the construction of these scales. One major criticism concerns the fact that a family rating approach is in itself a cumbersome, time-consuming, and expensive process. It is frequently not practical to require individual assessment of the family situation by a trained social worker. Other criticisms concern the nature of the construction of the test itself. For example, the studies used in the development of this particular prediction table were all completed in a restricted, high-delinquency area in New York City. In addition, the rating techniques used by the social workers in the assessment on these five major variables are subjective. The inherent subjectivity in these ratings can be seen in variables such as family cohesiveness and supervision. These particular factors are highly culturally dependent and often have little significance in lower-class families. Finally, the statistical treatment given the data accumulated by the Gluecks has

been assailed on a number of accounts with frequent claims that invalid statistical treatments were involved.

Validation of Prediction Efforts

Although many concurrent validation studies have been undertaken, very little data have been provided on the actual predictive validation of this instrument. The main reason for the lack of predictive validation data is the fact that most studies were conducted retrospectively dealing with known delinquent populations. In fact, only two prospective studies, other than those conducted by the Gluecks themselves, appear to have been undertaken. These are the Maximum Benefits Project, which was initiated in Washington, D. C., in 1954, and the New York City Youth Board Project, which is reviewed in the writings of Whelan (1954). The obtained data indicate that in neither project was the Gluecks' Scale able to efficiently predict delinquents as opposed to nondelinquents. In fairness to the Gluecks' Scale, it should be pointed out that circumstances surrounding the use of this scale were not ideal. The Maximum Benefits Project was not a true application of the Gluecks' Experience Scale but the project itself was not designed specifically to validate the Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale. The Scale was administered to a random sample of boys entering first grade. Serious questions arise, of course, as to whether or not the Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale can accurately be used to detect delinquency proneness in children five to six years of age. Despite the

authors' claim of validity at this age, it should be noted that the instrument was, in fact, originally standardized on boys whose ages ranged from 11 to 17 years. In any event, validation support for the Gluecks' work was not provided by the Maximum Benefits Project.

It would seem that the New York City Youth Board Study would provide the necessary criteria for adequate validation of the Gluecks' measuring device. This project was longitudinal in nature and used first grade boys from high delinquency areas in which Negro and Puerto Rican children composed a large population. Under such circumstances, this investigation would appear to be a very rigorous test of the Social Prediction Scale. It would also seem to indicate a measure of how well the table could be applied to a wide variety of racial and ethnic groups since the scale was, in fact, derived from a Caucasian sample.

The study's results are unfortunately discouraging. The three-factor scale, which was not the original instrument, was introduced in the middle of the experiment (that is, five years, in fact, after Whelan's New York City Board investigation had begun in 1952). As noted above, the three-factor scale was comprised of mother supervision, cohesiveness of the family, and father's discipline. The substitution was made because the authors argued this particular scale was more accurate than the initial five-factor scale. If one cares to investigate the rationale behind the substitution of the scales (the three-factor scale for the five-factor scale), a case can be made for

the fact that the latter instrument is more effective. Unfortunately, such a change in the instrumentation during a study in progress does alter the design of the study.

Whelan (1954) reports that abbreviated tables of the Social Prediction Scale do not do an adequate job in identifying potential delinquents. In using the abbreviated three-factor scale, correct prediction was obtained in 84.8% of the cases, but the forecast was that some 98.77% of the boys would be nondelinquent. These results suggest that there is a serious difficulty here. The Gluecks' Prediction Scale identified 70 of the 221 boys in the sample (31.7%) as potential delinquents requiring treatment. Such treatment efforts would, in fact, be unnecessary for 46 of the boys or two-thirds of the treatment group. In addition, one-fifth of the potential delinquents are missed by the Gluecks' screening device and would not receive appropriate treatment (Voss, 1963). The question, in this case, may be whether any agency interested in the prediction of delinquency can afford to use such an unreliable measuring device.

A number of other limitations of the Gluecks' instrument are cited by Voss (1963). Most of these criticisms concern the construction and standardization of the scale using an equal number of delinquents and nondelinquents, or an extreme population. Voss points out that samples of broader populations are needed to approximate the actual delinquency rates. This condition is necessary to construct a prediction scale containing prognostic power. Concerning the

applicability to other racial and ethnic groups, aside from the original Caucasian sample, Voss reports that the predictive accuracy for the Gluecks' Scale was 100% for Caucasian and Puerto Rican, and 92.6% for Negro boys predicted to be nondelinquents. On the other hand, the accuracy of the table was very low in its ability to predict potential delinquents. The predictability for Caucasians was 22.2%, for Negroes 36%, and for Puerto Ricans 36.4%. These predictions were correct in 76.5% of the cases, that is, 169 of the 221 cases studied. If these results indicate the true predictive nature of this instrument, then one must necessarily conclude the validity of the Gluecks' prognostic instrument is, at best, confined to use with lower-class Caucasian males. Voss (1963) concludes that the Gluecks have, in fact, not found a valid predictive instrument for juvenile delinquency. What they have developed is a prognostic tool which is only in the first stage of development, namely the establishment of criteria. The instrument awaits the next stage, which involves the application of the criteria prospectively to independent new samples.

The Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Checklist and Rating Scale

A second major diagnostic instrument for prediction of juvenile delinquency has been devised by Kvaraceus (1961) and is entitled the Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Rating Scale (KD Scale). The Checklist is comprised of 70 background variables which delinquents

are hypothesized to have. The form is generally filled out by the juvenile's teacher and requires a yes-no response to test items. The KD Scale items are constructed in a manner similar to a four-choice multiple-choice question. A nonverbal form of the KD Scale also exists. Test time on the nonverbal scale consists of 62 circles divided into four quadrants with a stimulus picture in each quadrant. The subject is asked to select which of the four pictures he prefers and which he likes least.

Validity data have been gathered in a detailed, three-year study on 1,594 students in junior high school, grades 7 through 9, and also on a small sample of retarded youths in special classes. Criterion data were determined by the behavioral adjustments made by individuals in the sample to school, neighborhood, and community over a predetermined time. Predictive efficiency of these instruments was studied by sex and grade using the following four-point scale. Sample subjects were classified according to categories of (1) never offending, (2) minor violations in school, (3) minor violations in school and community, and (4) serious offenses, including police and court records. Despite the care taken with the validation procedures of this particular instrument, an unfortunate lack of consistency in the data indicates that caution must be exercised in the employment of this particular instrument for decision making. A component in the validation procedure included a comparison between teacher nominations for potential delinquency as compared with the efficacy of this particular instrument in predicting

potential delinquent behavior. Teacher nominations proved to be, in some situations, as efficient, and in others, more effective, as predictors of future delinquency.

A number of research studies have been undertaken using the instruments designed by Kvaraceus. Of these studies (including Balogh, 1958; Bechtold, 1964; Clements, 1967; and Kvaraceus, 1961), the general conclusion reached by these researchers indicates that the most immediate need is for a long-term validation study. These studies have indicated that the KD Scale and Checklist are relatively valid predictive instruments for use in the prevention of delinquency. One must keep in mind the predominantly Negro and lower-class composition of the standardization populations. At the same time, it should be noted that the sample size was small. It is the opinion of one researcher that "the universe Kvaraceus used in his scale was statistically insignificant" (Balogh, 1958).

Kvaraceus' own validation of the nonverbal form of the KD Scale indicated that the nonverbal scale is not yet ready to be used in a school-community program of delinquency prevention. In summary, the findings concerning the Kvaraceus juvenile delinquency prediction tools all seem to indicate that, like those of other instruments discussed, there remains a strong need for long-term, randomly sampled prospective validation studies. Kvaraceus (1961) makes note of several factors which he suggests are worth further attention in predicting delinquency tendency. First, he suggests that reading

ability must be taken into account as just one symptom closely associated with the delinquency syndrome. Thus, close attention to poor readers during the middle school years may enable school personnel to focus on a group of youngsters who are perhaps already, or potentially soon to be, displaying behavioral disturbances. In addition, Kvaraceus notes that behavior rating by experienced teachers in some cases showed more promise of predictive ability than the KD Proneness Nonverbal Rating Scale.

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) has become a standard reference measure in determining personality profiles. Although not designed specifically for purposes of predicting juvenile delinquency, the MMPI has been used for these purposes. Briefly, this instrument developed by Hathaway and McKinley (1943) consists of individual and group administration forms and yields fourteen specific subscores reflecting a number of traits reflecting states of abnormal mental health. Five hundred and fifty statements comprise the instrument and cover a wide range of subject matter, from physical conditions of the individual being tested to his moral and social attitude. Statements are responded to as true-false or cannot say. The test rarely takes longer than 90 minutes to administer and can be completed in a period as brief as 30 minutes. No supervision is

generally required other than assurance of optimal cooperation from the subject; however, reading comprehension of approximately eighth-grade level is necessary.

Two scales, Scale Number 4 - Psychopathic Deviate and Scale Number 9 - Hypomania, have been shown to be predictive of delinquency in certain cases. For a number of reasons, the MMPI is not well-suited as an instrument to predict juvenile law violation. The MMPI is a measure of an individual's response, rather than a strict test of psychopathology. Test interpretation is difficult and requires sophistication on the part of the test administrator. Other criticism concerns the fact that the test was designed and standardized for the age range of 16 years and older. When used with a younger subject population, the MMPI loses a good deal of its sensitivity because of the inability of younger individuals to read and fully understand the items. Many of the test items would be inappropriate, or appear so, to a young subject. In addition, many teachers and parents object to specific questions regarding sexual activities and fantasy.

Despite these limitations, a number of studies have been undertaken using the MMPI as a predictor of potential delinquent tendencies. Hathaway and Monachesi (1951) have reviewed the various studies in which the MMPI was used as a predictive instrument. Hathaway and Monachesi, themselves, undertook a two-year followup study of high school boys and girls who had been administered the MMPI. Their sample population included 4,000 students. Examining these students

two years later indicated that of the initial 4,000 students examined, 591 had been arrested by the police or had court contact or both. An examination of the MMPI profiles of these delinquents indicated several patterns which showed promise in their ability to predict delinquent behaviors. The best predictors of antisocial behaviors were elevated scores on Scale 4 - Psychopathic Deviate, and Scale 9 - Hypomania.

Another interesting finding reported was that those adolescents whose MMPI profiles indicated no high deviation and were thereby indicated to be normal are very unlikely to be found delinquent. The nondelinquency prediction seems to be more substantiated in the data than any positive prediction of delinquency.

The greatest difficulty in predicting delinquency concerns the ambiguous middle group, indicated by any evaluative instrument in which demarcation between delinquency and nondelinquency is difficult and yet must be made. With respect to this problem, Hathaway and Monachesi note that it is probably not possible to identify such an individual within the confine of a single testing procedure, but rather determination of such inclinations would most likely depend upon a careful evaluation of circumstances precipitating a social behavior. This is to say, the tendency toward delinquency in the cases of such individuals would be variable. In this middle group of juveniles, Hathaway and Monachesi propose that the individual is acted upon by environmental circumstances. It is these particular circumstances which must be further evaluated in order to make any accurate predictions.

VARIABLES IN PSYCHSOCIAL/EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT

If appropriate comprehensive treatment programs are to be planned for adjudicated disruptive youth, psychosocial/educational assessment should include measures of a number of variables. These variables would minimally include assessment of the following categories:

1. Intellectual Capacity
2. Medical and Neurological Evaluation
3. Language Development
   a. Diagnosis of reading skills
   b. Diagnosis of mathematical computation
   c. Diagnosis of spelling ability
4. Academic Achievement Levels
   a. Standardized achievement tests
   b. Study and organizational skills evaluation
5. Personality and Self-Concept Evaluation
6. Vocational Interest Pattern Assessment

Intellectual Capacity

An estimate of intellectual capacity is needed for a number of reasons in the assessment of individual cognitive and social development. Educators can most accurately use such scores to predict rate of learning. Individual measures of intelligence, such as the Wechsler Intelligence Scales and the Stanford-Binet, provide psychologists and trained educators with detailed estimates of capacity in a number of

content areas. In the normal adolescent, there occur relatively even patterns of development as reflected by intelligence test subscores. In disturbed adolescents, however, these patterns show clusters of strengths and weaknesses. Awareness of individual variability can make a skilled teacher more competent in the selection of teaching techniques and materials which utilize the strengths of the given individual in overcoming apparent deficits.

Current data, collected from both adult penal institutions and records available on juvenile facilities, note the disproportionate number of incarcerated individuals who are found to be in the borderline or mentally retarded range. An individual limited in intellectual capacity is frequently unable to understand or to reason adequately in dealing with the environment. Such an individual frequently makes errors in judgment, is more easily swayed and influenced by others, and seems to lack the capacity for long-term planning.

Special education has demonstrated, however, that individuals with less than average intelligence can be educated to become self-sufficient. In vocationally-oriented or uniquely structured academic classes, many such individuals make considerable gains developing marketable skills that ensure enlargement. Their general functioning and capacity to meet societal demands can also be improved. For these reasons, one must caution against any restriction of educational programs for children with less than average intelligence. And even

more care should be taken to avoid labeling individuals, particularly if no effective remediation program follows such classification.

The measurement of intelligence has always raised considerable question. The most reliable and theoretically valid tests of intelligence [including the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - R (revised), or the Stanford-Binet, Forms L-M] must be administered by a trained psychometrist. These instruments usually require approximately one hour or longer for administration. There are other available tests which purport to provide derived IQ scores, but these tests sample far fewer behaviors and thus are basically screening tests. The Slossen Intelligence Test is a widely used instrument requiring approximately 30 minutes to administer. A number of the items on the SIT are drawn from the Stanford-Binet and some from the Wechsler Scales. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test is a screening intelligence test which taps only receptive vocabulary. Paper-and-pencil IQ tests, such as the Otis-Lennon or the Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability and numerous others, require a reading level at approximately fifth to seventh grade before validity can be ascertained. Further, a paper-and-pencil intelligence testing is only as accurate as the test conditions under which one is administered. During an individually administered test, the examiner can monitor the motivational level of an individual and pull from him information that he might not otherwise offer. On a paper-and-pencil test, particularly where there are multiple-choice

items, many individuals who have had poor experiences in school merely mark answers to be finished with an unpleasant task. They fail to realize the consequences of an invalid score.

Culture free intelligence tests, more recently labeled culture fair tests, are both difficult to find and at best only fair to the culture on which they are standardized. The early attempts at avoiding language have not proved successful. For example, the Raven's Progressive Matrices, the Kohs Block Design Tests, and even the Leighter International Performance Scale, are still heavily influenced by social class and school experience. Because many delinquents have a very erratic school record and frequently come from low SES families, screening intelligence test instruments are of limited value. Furthermore, such measurements may lack meaningful data for important decision-making by staff. Individual estimates of intelligence are clearly the preferred mode of assessment.

Medical and Neurological Evaluation

Careful attention should be paid during initial intake for possible neurological handicaps. The epileptic and seizure-prone individual makes up a far greater proportion of adjudicated adults than is found in the general populations. The typical explanation for this observation is that incarcerated individuals lack the capacity to delay

gratification and have low frustration tolerance or excitation limits. Such an organic-based syndrome is characterized by quick or sudden anger outbursts, difficulty in maintaining delay components for gratification, and general impulsivity. Unfortunately, no totally valid psychological test is available to specify neurological malfunction. Possible diagnostic techniques continue to receive considerable attention, particularly in the work of Ralph Reitan at the University of Indiana, as well as numerous other investigators, such as Larry Hartlege at the University of Georgia Medical School. At this time, both the administration and interpretation of instruments designed to detect neurological dysfunction are well beyond the training levels of the majority of people working in penal institutions. The procedures usually require a coordinated staff of physicians, psychologists, and laboratory technicians found only at medical schools or elaborate hospital settings in large urban centers.

Psychologists have frequently relied upon the use of tests, such as the Bender-Gestalt or other geometric copying tasks (Development Test of Visual Motor Integration, Rutgers Drawing Test, the Winterhaven Test) for one estimate of possible interference in motor coordination. The reliability of such diagnosis remains somewhat less than desirable. In general, however, these tests can detect the individual who demonstrates deficits in fine muscle motor control coordination which suggest neurological dysfunction. The occurrence of severe motor deficits on one of the above instruments

should lead to a more extensive examination by a neurologist, who could recommend medication or other forms of appropriate treatment.

Careful history may provide further significant clues in detecting neurological disorders. Fainting or blackout spells, the occurrence of a serious head injury, chronic and/or consistent headache patterns, marked difference in appetite or sleep patterns, and sudden change in behavior may give indications warranting more extensive medical examination.

Language Development

The public school system in the United States is essentially a lock-step grade system into which children enter at around age six and are graduated from somewhere between the ages of 17 and 19 (12 years later in their history). Success in the system is predicated on mastery of basic language skills in reading, written expression, and math. It is expected that most children with an average IQ would make such grade progress in a linear fashion. A large number of children with developmental language lags whose individual needs are not met by the grade system nonetheless remain locked into that system. The capacity to individualize academic programs depending upon the specific language levels of children is a concept widely discussed, but unfortunately less frequently implemented.

Throughout the research literature, the academic achievement levels of institutionalized male delinquents have pointed to serious underachievement. It is now estimated that perhaps as many as 70% of adjudicated male delinquents have mild to severe learning disabilities. Sixty percent of delinquents in a recent sample by Sabatino, Mauser, and Skok (1975) were reported to have less than a 2.5 grade level reading comprehension score while their chronological ages ranged from 12 to 17. Ability to read, write, and perform simple math computations are essential skills required by contemporary society. Individuals handicapped in these areas are always frustrated as well as existing at a decided disadvantage. The severe reading problems which characterize so many males in this population deserve paramount attention during the average six to nine months' period of incarceration.

The average delinquent is decidedly not interested in school. He frequently has a high truancy record. School failure is another frequent component. These parameters are often the result of early problems in mastering reading and other basic language foundations. One study by Shore, Massimo, and Ricks (1965) strongly suggests that lowered recidivism follows a marked enhancement of self-concept; but the essential precursor of an improved self-concept is bringing the literacy skills, particularly reading, up to meaningful societal levels, somewhere between fifth and seventh grade. Individuals in our society who cannot read at a minimum fifth-grade level are seriously handicapped. They are unable to read sufficiently to get driver's licenses,

complete employment forms, understand newspaper headlines, even to follow directions printed in buildings and other areas for travel. They are illiterate in the broadest sense of that term and severely handicapped in their interactions with others. The frustrations and anger, as well as the constant sense of inadequacy, engendered by this deficit, appear to be the prime motivators for the antisocial behavior described by McCandless and McDavid (1962).

Diagnosis of Reading Skills

The diagnosis of reading skills can be accomplished quite easily. The process of reading is more than mere calling of words; it requires comprehension, that is, an understanding of content. Speed of reading, memory capacity when reading silently, as well as oral fluency skills, are all important aspects of reading assessment when making educational prognosis for adjudicated norm violators. There are a number of effective test instruments, including standardized achievement tests, which essentially monitor an individual's ability to read words of increasing difficulty. The most accurate indices are individual informal reading tests. The informal reading inventory asks an individual to read aloud to an examiner. Examples of these instruments are the Gray Oral Reading Test (Grades 1 through 12), the Durrell-Analysis of Reading Difficulty (Grades 1 through 7), the Gates McKillop Reading Diagnostic Tests (Grades 1 through 8), and

numerous others. The basic requirement is that the individual be able to read and comprehend a paragraph of a certain grade level difficulty. If he can read with 80 percent accuracy on both decoding (word calling) and comprehension skills, it is assumed that he can essentially read at that given grade level. If a student can read adequately at seventh-grade level or better, no further exploration of reading is needed. If he cannot read adequately, it may be necessary to utilize more intensive diagnostic approaches measuring whole word recognition, usually utilizing Dolch list of words at varying grade levels and phonetic word decoding skills. One should measure various comprehension levels following both oral and silent reading, as well as listening comprehension, as in the test framework of the Durrell-Analysis of Reading Difficulty.

The Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests is a comprehension reading diagnostic battery determining both vocabulary level, word recognition, and comprehension skills. This test requires 30 to 40 minutes for administration, but does provide the teacher responsible for reading with a detailed analysis of strengths and weaknesses in the reading process as well as appropriate entry level for instructional material. The broad dimensions of the reading process should become much more widely included in initial assessment procedures than is currently evident. It is a far more sensitive approach to understanding reading problems than is the grade-level score reported

by the Wide Range Achievement Test, which is only an estimate of phonetic decoding ability.

The classroom level of reading instruction should be carefully tailored to the individual's needs. In recent decades, there has been an explosion of materials designed for poor readers. These materials typically are comprised of low vocabulary level but high interest content which should increase their effectiveness with older students who are poor readers.

Diagnosis of Mathematical Computation

Determining an appropriate instructional level for mathematics is, for the most part, dependent upon standardized achievement test scores. Only recently has there been the introduction of more elaborate measures for diagnosis of math ability, particularly for the primary school grades. The Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test is an example of a commercially available screening instrument covering a wide variety of practical and applied mathematics. The test takes approximately 35 minutes for administration. Subtests measure addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, as well as the other general components of math, but also evaluates metric units, time, money, change, and word problem solution. A total of 17 variables or math activities are delineated by specific grade-level proficiencies. The number of delinquents who do not have an adequate

understanding of time units and money is large. Many lack a conceptual understanding of mileage units, distance, rate, and other applied math components which underlie the ability to do advanced science courses offered in high school. These are technical language handicaps which prevent such students from being able to compete in certain school courses, but more importantly block avenues for particular jobs and possibly careers.

Key Math should be administered by the school personnel responsible for math instruction. The math portion of the Wide Range Achievement Test is a viable screening estimate of general math capacity. Grade-level math ability is reliably assessed in standardized achievement tests. The shortcoming of the achievement test estimate is the lack of specificity of developmental gaps in math ability which may be present or their inclusion of practical application of math such as making change.

The practical understanding of math is a pressing problem for delinquents. The need for algebra, geometry, and trigonometry courses is less important in facilities for disruptive youth. The most urgent need is to raise practical knowledge of math applications so that these students can carry on effective commerce and effectively cope with day-to-day economics required in our society.

Diagnosis of Spelling Ability

Spelling skills remain one of the most neglected diagnostic areas in all psychometric evaluations. Few diagnostic instruments provide adequate measures of spelling ability. Yet, the majority of graded material in school requires written answers. The inability to express in writing what one may know is a decided disadvantage.

Careful attention should be made by teachers that an individual can spell sufficiently to express his ideas in writing. One can rarely spell better than he can read. Many adjudicated adolescents will show as much as a two-year lag in spelling below their reading comprehension level. Schools have frequently made this problem worse by certain teacher's careful attention to correct spelling and by repetitive drill for practice of errors.

The spelling test on the Wide Range Achievement Test and the spelling test on the Durrell-Analysis of Reading Difficulty are both useful guides to approximate grade placement. The standardized achievement tests, such as the Stanford and Metropolitan, at the middle school years and high school years evaluate spelling by a student's ability to correctly spot a misspelled word, but do not include in their batteries the actual written component. Many students may be able to tell you that a word is incorrectly spelled but will be unable themselves to spell it correctly. Criterion reference instruments developed by individual schools may be the most appropriate

manner for evaluating a student's capacity to express knowledge by writing. It is not that the attainment of a particular grade level should be stressed in spelling, but rather teachers should ensure that students have sufficient capacity to express their written ideas at their level of reading comprehension.

Academic Achievement Levels

Standardized achievement tests are the most commonly utilized measures of academic performance levels in public schools, as well as in the majority of institutions for delinquents. Standardized group achievement tests consist of samples of content-oriented questions presented in a multiple-choice format which require grade-level reading ability. They are usually administered with time limitations. A review of the specifications of tests would indicate that these instruments are basically power tests. The time dimensions are given primarily because additional time does not increase the accuracy score for the majority of students. Examples of standardized group achievement tests would include the Stanford Achievement Test Battery, the Metropolitan Achievement Test Battery, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, but there exist numerous others. These tests are usually designed at specific grade levels for the elementary school grade levels and two or more forms for the

high school student. The number of subscales on such achievement tests range from seven to ten or more. Time for the high school student to complete the total battery is between six and eleven hours.

The high school battery would be the most appropriate achievement test for the grade level of most adjudicated delinquents. However, the reading levels of many delinquents indicate that they would be unable to adequately understand either the directions or the questions. Minimum reading comprehension level requirement for understanding high-school level standardized achievement tests is at least seventh grade and preferably higher.

These tests are highly inappropriate for children who have either poor school attendance records and/or serious language problems. The survey by Sabatino, et al., (1975) found that more than half of male delinquents were reported to be reading at less than 2.5 grade level. Depressed reading ability would preclude the use of the high-school level achievement tests. In cases of suspected reading difficulty, a comprehensive reading test would be a far more meaningful diagnostic instrument for selecting beginning instructional level than would an achievement test. Frequently confused with the detailed achievement tests, such as the Stanford and the Metropolitan achievement batteries, is the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT). The WRAT is a screening instrument measuring word pronunciation (which the authors label reading), samples of math computations, and a spelling test. Thus, this test, while normed on a large number of

individuals, tends to overestimate by one year or more the elementary grade equivalent scores obtained on the more inclusive standardized achievement tests. The WRAT is frequently used because it can be administered quickly. Being only a screening instrument, it requires somewhere between 10 and 15 minutes for the average student to complete. The nature of the WRAT, then, suggests it to be inappropriate in determining estimates for entry level instruction or measurement of academic gain.

A final note of caution should be made. The average student does not show progressive grade-level gains throughout the high school years. Whereas grade-level scores for the elementary-school level are generally associated with average proficiency, as one approaches the middle school years, there is a decided ceiling effect. Only a smaller percentage of college-bound students continue to show yearly gains throughout high school. Percentile scores become more accurate indicators of average gain. There also occurs at early adolescence an increasing correlation between general intelligence capacity and achievement levels. The shift in source of variance is much more than may be directly attributable to instructional activities in a classroom. As stated previously, minimal reading competencies of approximately eighth-grade level are required for successful completion of any of the high school achievement batteries. Students who do not possess this level of reading comprehension will always score

considerably lower on these instruments, despite the fact that they may know the correct answer.

The usefulness of standardized achievement tests rests in their ability to provide grade-level equivalencies for a variety of subject areas. One must be careful, however, in selecting appropriate entry instructional level textbooks on the basis of these scores. These tests assume a series of instructional progressions which are not always followed by different textbook authors.

Study and Organizational Skills Evaluation

Teachers and psychologists, when planning educational programs for adjudicated delinquents, should evaluate a student's ability to organize material, his ability to scan material to find useful facts, his reading speed, and his general approach to study matters. The poor school records of most delinquents allows one to predict that, as a group, they are poorer than the average high-school student in terms of their ability to draw main ideas and ability to sequence important facts. They probably also lack the ability to take notes, outline, and condense material. However, these are teachable skills. They are effective ways of making academic tasks less difficult. Study skills assessment is an overlooked area of the majority of diagnostic procedures. While this area may not require assessment at

time of intake, it should be carefully monitored by teachers as they work with students. Individual attention to study skill deficits should be made early during incarceration. Improved study skills combined with an appropriate individualized curriculum should increase a student's motivation toward school accomplishment.

Several formal psychometric measures of study skills are available. The high school battery of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests provides measures of study skills in language and in social studies. These measures are more accurately an estimate of an individual's capacity to follow printed directions or understand information presented in different forms such as tables or graphs. The test is valid only if the client possesses at least eighth-grade reading proficiency.

Study skills are included in the Comprehension Tests of Basic Skills with four separate grade levels between second grade and high school. These tests measure the ability of students to use library references, encyclopedias, maps, graphs, and charts. Unfortunately, the tests do not deal with the process of effective study or attitude toward school. Research suggests that minimal reading skills of at least mid-third grade level are required for even the lowest form level of the test. A similar test for grades four through nine is the SRA Achievement Series: Work-Study Skills.

Several study skills evaluation tests exist for high school students who anticipate college entrance. These instruments would include the Cornell Critical Thinking Test and the Study Skills Test: McGraw-Hill Basic Skills System. These latter tests are appropriate only for students achieving at eleventh-grade level equivalents or higher.

Personality Assessment

Definitive assessment of personality dimensions remains an enigma to most practicing clinicians. Most agree that the personality makeup of individuals strongly contributes to their behavior patterns, their predictability, and should be an essential dimension in a full diagnostic profile for a given individual.

Unfortunately, there are few concise and comprehensive measures of personality which can be used reliably with any population.

Projective techniques have been frequently utilized to make the final differentiation between normalcy and the clinical diagnosis of severe neurosis and psychosis. Instruments such as the Rorschach InkBlot Test, the Thematic Apperception Test, and numerous others require one or more hours for administration. The administration and interpretation of these techniques usually require doctoral-level training in clinical psychology and considerable experience. Even the

predictive or mechanical scoring systems as used by Kvaraceus in utilization of responses on the Rorschach InkBlot Test remain a cumbersome, time-consuming, and difficult administrative task for the majority of psychologists or counselors responsible for such services in institutions. These techniques have low reliability and questionable construct validity. They do not appear to be promising practical approaches to the problems of delinquents.

Target behavior assessment has been suggested by Paul (1966) and Ullman and Krasner (1965) as an appropriate behavior method for the categorization of individuals who may then require more extensive and in-depth interview and/or clinical assessment. One can predict with certainty that a significant number of inmates in juvenile facilities have serious emotional problems. At least, a portion of these would be more appropriately placed in facilities for the emotionally disturbed rather than facilities for behavior correction which essentially characterize youth development centers. Target assessment techniques include observation of interpersonal relationships, behavioral consistency, classroom awareness, and other behavioral indices which could be gathered by individuals working with the client. The authors emphasize that there are difficulties associated with such approaches. Careful base rate recording and communication between different professional staff are required as they interact with a given client across time. The practical information collected, however, is

directly usable by a staff for planning and/or reacting to the problems of a given delinquent.

A number of paper-and-pencil personality assessment instruments have been reviewed previously in the section of this chapter reviewing efforts to predict delinquency. Such inventories designed to measure personality development are frequently used with adults. The most frequently used instrument is the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. As described earlier in this chapter, the test is read and answered by the subject. Time requirements are an hour or more, but the test requires a basic reading comprehension level of at least eighth-grade capacity. For the majority of clients in facilities for juveniles, this is an inappropriate instrument. Further, interpretation is a multifactor comparison and cannot be done on the basis of scores alone. The MMPI and other paper-and-pencil indices of personality pathology may provide more inappropriate classification labels rather than provide useful insights for the staff personnel who will be working with disruptive youth. Considerable caution must be exercised in the use of such tests, both in terms of the time and cost expenditure and the possibility of inappropriate application.

Locus of control can be attributed to oneself or the environment. The extent one feels in control of his life appears to be an important variable. The measurement of this important dimension has developed in terms of the introversion/extroversion scale by Rotter (1966). A child or school age scale has been developed by

Norwicki-Strickland (1968), which could have useful application, considering the academic levels of most delinquents in many institutions. The scale can be read by the individual or administered orally. Introversion/extroversion measurement is utilized frequently in current research. In general, the more internalized one is, the less likely he is to be swayed by his environment or by the influence of his peers. One's reliance on internal mechanisms has been shown to be an important dimension for the effectiveness of psychotherapy. Unfortunately, the average delinquent generally scores high on the extroversion component of this measurement. But those individuals who show change toward an internalized state are usually considered to be showing positive progress and improvement. Considerably more research is needed, particularly with delinquents for the construct validity of this scale with regards to prediction of future recidivism. It is a promising approach, however, and one that should receive careful attention, particularly for problem children referred after their initial psychosocial evaluation and for individuals who are returning to youth development facilities.

California Psychological Inventory

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI), developed by Gough (1959), is designed to measure those character traits which

arise directly and necessarily from interpersonal interaction. The assessment of these traits is then hypothesized to allow for the understanding and prediction of social behavior in any situation in any culture. The CPI is comprised of 18 subtests which, in turn, consist of a total of 480 test items. Almost half of these items are taken from the MMPI. Items are responded to in a true-false manner. The CPI is designed to assess the psychological adjustment of children 13 years of age and older.

Although Gough originally designed the CPI to be open-ended to allow for the addition of new scales as needed, he has chosen not to do so. Rather, he has elected to utilize linear combinations of the existing 18 scales for applied prediction purposes. Among the regression equations formulated on the basis of the original scales are one to predict social maturity versus delinquency and one to predict parole outcome.

A major criticism of the CPI concerns the high intercorrelation of the subtests. Factor analysis does not support the hypothesis that the subtests are independent measures of personality variables. In addition to its redundancy and lack of parsimony, the CPI is criticized for a failure to include a sufficient number of duplicated items to allow for scoring of response consistency and response validity. Although the CPI is well normed, test-retest reliabilities are only moderate, ranging from .58 to .75 over a one-year period.

In favor of the CPI is the fact that it is one of the few personality inventories with enough empirical research collected to allow a user to evaluate its probable utility in an educational setting. However, the large number of scales makes the CPI difficult to interpret conceptually and cumbersome to use in counseling. The advanced reading level required to complete the CPI also reduces its effectiveness in use with potentially delinquent populations.

The California Life Goals Evaluation Schedules

The California Life Goals Evaluation Schedules, developed by Hahn (1966), are scales which attempt to determine an individual's desired future conditions. Based upon an assessment of an individual's economic, social, and political attitudes, the California Life Goals Evaluation Schedules claim to determine directions of motivation. There are ten schedules (or life goals) which investigate constructs including esteem, profit, fame, power, leadership, security, social service, interesting experiences, self-expression, and independence. The test contains a total of 150 highly debatable statements; the subject responds on a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. After responses are scored, a profile is drawn up on the basis of the ten life goals.

For a number of reasons, the California Life Goals Evaluation Schedules appear to be still in the experimental phase. The author indicates that norms, reliabilities, and validities, are still tentative. In addition, it is not yet clear whether or not the fifteen items on each scale comprise an adequate sampling of the concept. Because this instrument has been designed for use with individuals 15 years of age and over, the reading level of this test would most likely require revision downward to be of major use with delinquent populations.

The California Test of Personality: A Profile of Personal and Social Adjustment

The California Test of Personality (Thorpe, Clark, & Tiegs, 1953) consists of a series of five questionnaires designed to measure personal and social adjustment components in children. Each of the five components is designed for a specific age range, including three years of age through kindergarten, four through eight years of age, seven through ten years of age, nine through sixteen years of age, and adults. The five components are basically uniform throughout this series. A major advantage of this particular test is the fact that it may be administered to groups, although individual oral administration is recommended for the primary scale.

The nature of the scales is generally directed toward items assessing self-adjustment and social adjustment. The self-adjustment scale is divided into six subtests which examine self-reliance, personal worth, personal freedom, feeling of belonging, withdrawing tendencies, and nervous symptoms. The social adjustment scale is also based on six subtests which investigate social standards, social skills, antisocial tendencies, family relations, school relations, and community relations.

Norms are provided for the evaluation of scores yielded by these particular tests. Anastasi (1968) suggests that internal consistency reliabilities are reasonably satisfactory for the total score yielded and also for the two subtotals. Self-adjustment and social adjustment are clearly important in predicting and diagnosing delinquency. Again, however, no careful studies utilizing the California Test of Personality have been reported with incidence data for delinquents.

A Two-Step Process for Identifying Emotionally Handicapped Pupils

A practical method of identifying emotionally disturbed children from within a general school population is offered by Lambert and Bower (1961) in their Two-Step Process for Identifying Emotionally Handicapped Pupils. The two steps involved in the procedure are

briefly as follows. Initially, a screening procedure is undertaken to identify children having difficulty in school because of suspected emotional disabilities. This procedure is followed by further identification of those children within this selected group whose emotional difficulties appear to be sufficient to cause them extreme adjustment problems in school. The initial screening involves three types of measures which are designed to gather information concerned with the child's interaction in the classroom. Specifically, these three measures involve the teacher's perception of the pupil's behavior on a day-to-day basis, perception by the classmates of their fellow pupils' school behavior, and the child's self-perception. Those students who score above a certain rank on any two of the three screening measures are indicated as likely to be handicapped emotionally and are thus referred for further diagnostic treatment. It has generally been found that this selected group includes approximately 10 percent to 15 percent of the school population. The instruments which were developed for these screening procedures include the assessment of teacher ratings, peer ratings, and self ratings. Forms were designed to allow for the use of these screening procedures at primary, elementary, and secondary grade levels.

A distinct drawback to the use of the Two-Step Process for Identifying Emotionally Handicapped Pupils is that it requires massive amounts of paper work. The validity of these particular screening processes has been subject to many different tests. According to

Bower (1960), some nine out of ten children who were identified through the screening procedures in this two-step process were found, on the basis of individual followup study, to have emotional problems ranging from moderate to severe. The authors of the Two-Step Process for Identifying Emotionally Handicapped Pupils also claim it to be sensitive in detecting moderate to serious emotional problems in children who are not readily identifiable and who thus have not been reported as requiring assistance from school psychology personnel. One can readily anticipate that a significant number of such students will be delinquents, but to date no defined population incidence data are available.

The Ego Ideal and Conscience Development Test (EICDT)

The Ego Ideal and Conscience Development Test (EICDT), developed by Cassel (1969), has two forms and is a paper-and-pencil instrument, consisting of nine subtests: (1) home and family, (2) inner development, (3) community relations, (4) rules and law, (5) school and education, (6) romance and psychosexual, (7) economic sufficiency, (8) self-actualization, and (9) a total score across other subtests. The instrument attempts to discriminate between delinquents and nondelinquents in their ego ideal development. Unfortunately, this instrument is low in test validity. The premise of the test is that the ego ideal and consequent conscience development in

delinquents is markedly different from the development of such constructs in nondelinquents. Although there is some evidence that this device can distinguish delinquent and nondelinquent youth (Reise, 1969), further reliability and validity studies must be conducted before concluding that this instrument is assessing a phenomenon that does, in fact, exist.

Behavior Cards: A Test Interview for Delinquent Children

Behavior Cards, developed by Stodgill (1949), are designed to provide a structured interview technique to assist in distinguishing potentially delinquent children. This instrument requires the subject to sort 150 cards which describe specific behaviors. Sorting is done on the basis of whether or not the described behavior is characteristic of the individual. In addition to the advantages gained by allowing for an interview, the Behavior Cards also are well suited to use with a potentially delinquent population in that they require only a fourth-grade reading level.

Average reliability coefficient between items was reported to be .68 and .72 for two groups of male delinquents, and .52 for a group of female delinquents. Validation and normative data are on small samples and no data are available to date on nondelinquent populations. Despite the relatively inadequate norming, validation, and reliability procedures undertaken for this instrument, the Behavior Cards seem

worthy of further research, particularly concerning their potential clinical value where individual assessment techniques are required.

The Hostility and Direction of Hostility Questionnaire (HDHQ)

The Hostility and Direction of Hostility Questionnaire (HDHQ) is an instrument developed in Britain by Caine, Foulds, and Hope (1967). The major assumption upon which the HDHQ is based is the hypothesis that aggression and severity of emotional disorder are highly related. Unfortunately, this speculation remains unfounded. No research data exist at this time to substantiate the relationship between emotional disturbance and aggression.

The nature of this particular instrument is as follows. Items taken from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory were used on the basis of their face validity to assess five selected traits. The five subtests assessed variables of hostile acting out, criticism of others, projected delusional hostility (paranoia), self-criticism, and guilt. The reliability of this 51-item test is predictably low. Correlations between these five subscores and factor analysis of the intercorrelations suggest the existence of two main factors. The amount of hostility is determined by the sum of the five scores. The direction of hostility (intra- versus extra-punitive) is indicated by comparing the first three subtests with the last two.

The Hand Test

The instruments reviewed thus far have been predominantly paper-and-pencil self-reporting instruments or instruments completed as the result of personal interviews. The Hand Test in contrast to the above instruments is an individual projective test. Individual projective tests are not frequently used in the assessment of potential juvenile delinquency for a number of reasons. Often such instruments do not report reliabilities or validities, and they generally fail to serve as instruments that are capable of producing valuable empirical data in response to research questions. A notable exception, however, appears to be this relatively new instrument.

The Hand Test, developed by Wagner in 1959, is aimed chiefly at adults, but may also be successfully used with children as young as six years of age. The test consists of ten cards, nine of which show hands drawn in various positions and a tenth card which is blank. In addition to the standard cards, there now exists a group administered form which has been designed for experimental use.

Wagner's initial interest was the development of a projective technique to reveal aggression. He contends that the hand represents a natural medium by which important tendencies toward hostility and aggressiveness can be reflected. A subject's responses to the Hand Test as explained in the manual are classified into one or another of

fifteen formal scoring categories such as affection, dependence, exhibitionism, aggressive tension, etc.

Attempts to indicate any validity criterion of the Hand Test have been based, thus far, on the ability to discriminate between individual subjects. Data collected indicate the following results in the use of this particular instrument. Wagner (1962) found that interpersonal, active, maladjustive, and withdrawal responses scored from the Hand Test successfully differentiated a population of 50 male schizophrenics from 50 college students. Use of the Hand Test was also the basis for the differentiation between 60 schizophrenics and 40 neurotics using a matched-pair design with this test (Wagner, 1962).

Further study using this instrument (Bricklin, Protrowski, & Wagner, 1962) described and compared differences in number and percentage of responses, as well as other scoring categories, for groups of normals, neurotics, schizophrenics, prison inmates, organics, and epileptics. Findings indicated the following: normals had the highest number of absolute responses, inmates the lowest; epileptic patients gave the greatest number and percentage of problematic responses. Although these findings with adults need replication with juvenile offenders, the findings are provocative.

Self-Concept

Recent research investigators have indicated that several variables not normally assessed in psychosocial assessment are important variables for understanding both the past history of delinquents and assisting them in developing strengths and skills which should avoid recidivism. Self-concept has been shown to be an important variable for distinguishing between antisocial individuals and those who take pride in both their own accomplishment and their position within society. But people who feel inadequate, lack confidence in their own capacity, who are angry and are frustrated by their deficits rather than confident in their capacities are high-risk individuals not only for crime but for mental disturbance. Several formal tests for measurement of self-concept exist.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Test (TSCS) purports to measure both personal, family, social-ethic and other aspects of self. The TSCS consists of 100 self-description items. Ninety of these items assess self-concept; the remaining ten items assess self-criticism. Fourteen scores are derived in the Counseling Form which is felt to be suitable for feedback to the client. The same items are utilized in a more specific fashion to general scores on 30 dimensions on the Clinical and Research Form.

The TSCS correlates high with measures of anxiety such as the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. The lack of appropriate factor

analytic studies leaves open the question of whether the TSCS can validly generate fourteen to thirty separate measures from a pool of only 100 items.

The scale requires a seventh-grade reading level. The instrument has surprisingly good reliability. Time for administration is 30 to 45 minutes. The results are difficult to hand score but computor scoring is available. Interpretation is complex but does provide normed estimates of areas of normalcy or felt inferiority. Important scores of self-concept are identified which could be valuable in remediation efforts.

The Test of Social Intelligence is a measure of an individual's social cognition which involves the process of knowing or understanding other persons, their thinking, and their feeling. The test derives from Guilford's model of intelligence. Reliability is variable on various subtests but generally adequate. Responses require choosing multiple-choice formats of pictures or cartoons. Normative data are based on a sample of eleventh-grade middle-class students. No populations of adjudicated youth have been studied. The instrument does hold promise, however, for improving a client's perception of others and a possible influence toward better self-understanding.

Several tests which are widely used with adult populations hold some promise for older delinquent populations. Unfortunately, as the MMPI, these paper-and-pencil instruments require reading levels of eighth grade or better. Such instruments would include the Edwards

Personal Preference Schedule or the Thorndike Dimensions of Temperament. These instruments measure an individual's personality traits attempting to describe his basic behavior response. As such they are useful to a fuller understanding of personality and self-concept development. The majority of delinquents lack sufficient experience in given situations to respond to a number of items. The test requires an hour or longer for completion. These are unlikely to be of value for most delinquents but could provide useful resources in select cases.

Vocational Interest Pattern Assessment

Complete assessment of psychosocial variables in populations of adjudicated youth should at least include some component of eventual interest in vocations or occupations. There are evident minimal academic competencies required for many occupations. Realistic understanding of one's skills is indispensable in realistic planning. Interview or discussion approaches to monitoring an individual's anticipated work goals are frequent roles of counselors. Paper-and-pencil surveys are used with success in college populations and certain groups of high school students. These approaches must be used cautiously, however, with delinquents.

The Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Men and for Women are the most widely used survey of vocational interests. Unfortunately, these instruments are designed to monitor the emerging interests of older adolescents and young adults. Norms are provided only for individuals sixteen and older. Required reading comprehension is minimally eighth grade. Specific vocabulary and diversity of experience more typically acquired in middle-class families are necessary. The response profile can be hand scored, but it is a laborious and complex task. Machine scoring is preferred but is moderately expensive. The Strong Vocational Interest Blank would be primarily useful for only the unusual delinquent; that is, one with above average high-school level literacy skills and vocational aspirations into activities of professional or managerial responsibility.

The Kuder General Interest Survey (KGIS) is a relatively new instrument which is more useful for the average incarcerated juvenile male population than the Revised Kuder Preference Record or the Strong Vocational Interest Battery. The KGIS is designated for grades 6 to 12. Required reading level has been kept simple and can be easily understood by adolescents with sixth-grade reading comprehension skills. Preference for ten work activities are scored. These include outdoor, mechanical, computational, scientific, persuasive, artistic, literary, musical, social service, and clerical. Profiles can be hand scored or machine scored. Considering the age and technical work experience of the majority of adjudicated delinquents,

the more elaborate and refined dimensions of the Kuder Occupational Interest Survey require more experience and vocational knowledge than they possess.

A number of tests such as the Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory require experience and/or minimal knowledge about the world of work. These tests require precise vocabulary and considerable information about vocations. They are standardized on populations of young adults; thus they are not generally appropriate for the age group represented by adjudicated delinquents.

No vocational interest pattern instruments have been used extensively with adjudicated disruptive youth with longitudinal followup to measure their effectiveness. Clearly, such research activities are sorely needed. It may well be that the diversity of literacy skills in incarcerated juvenile populations is such that it precludes heavy reliance on paper-and-pencil inventory profiles which have proved useful with graduating high school seniors and college populations.

Work evaluation or the work sample method utilized by vocational rehabilitation agencies is more likely to be of primary value for assessment of vocational potential. Work evaluation may also allow the incarcerated individual an opportunity to understand in a practical sense the variety of work experiences available to him. Technical and vocational education will increasingly become more viable as an avenue to adult financial independence for increasing percentages of

our population in the United States. This pattern has been evident over the past fifteen years. For the majority of adjudicated delinquents with their generally hostile attitude toward school achievement, vocational training may be a far more positive experience with realistic support.

SUMMARY

Psychosocial assessment of youth convicted of minor and/or major societal norm violation remains an individual problem. Only in the broadest terms of major areas of assessment can a model be described. The changeable nature of adolescents as they grow to adult maturity is itself a major hurdle. The lack of assessment instruments designed for the partially unique problems of adjudicated youth is a major drawback. Only by more thorough and appropriate entry assessment can facilities anticipate to offer programs which can be effective in changing the behavior patterns of such youth. Each youth brings his own personal history and attributes. Each in his own way needs particular constellations of education and treatment programs. It is anticipated that the psychosocial assessment procedures described in this chapter can move closer to that goal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing. (3rd Ed.) New York: The MacMillan Co., 1968.

Balogh, J. Juvenile delinquency proneness: A study of prediction factors involved in delinquent phenomena. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1958, 48, 615-618.

Bechtold, M. L. Validation of the KD scale and checklist as a prediction of delinquent proneness. Journal of Experimental Education, 1964, 32, 413-416.

Bower, E. M. Early identification of emotionally handicapped children in the school. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1960.

Bricklin, B., Protrowski, Z., and Wagner, E. The hand test: A new projective test with special reference to the prediction of overt aggressive behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1962.

Brookover, W. B. Self-concept of ability and school achievement. III. Relationship of self-concept to achievement in school. U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2831. East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1967.

Caine, T. M., Foulds, G. A., and Hope, K. Hostility and direction of hostility questionnaire. London, England: University of London Press, Ltd., 1967.

Cassel, R. Ego ideal and conscience development test. Hollywood, California: Monitor, 1969.

Clements, S. D. The predictive utility of three delinquency proneness measures. Dissertation Abstracts, March 1967, 20, 3827.

Farls, R. J. High and low achievement of intellectually average intermediate grade students related to the self-concept and social approval. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28, 1205 (Abstract).

Glueck, E. Spotting potential delinquents--Can it be done? Federal Probation, 1956, 20, 7-13.

Glueck, E. and Glueck, S. Unraveling juvenile delinquency. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Gough, E. H. California psychological inventory. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1959.

Hahn, M. E. The California life goals' evaluation schedules. Los Angeles, California: Western Psychological Services, 1966.

Hathaway, S. R. and McKinley, C. The Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1943.

Hathaway, S. R. and Monachesi, E. D. Analyzing and predicting juvenile delinquency with the MMPI. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.

Jones J. G. and Strowig, R. W. Adolescent identity and self-perception as predictors of scholastic achievements. Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 62, 78-82.

Kvaraceus, W. C. Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Rating Scale and Checklist. New York: World Book Company, 1953.

Kvaraceus, W. C. Forecasting delinquency: A three-year experiment. Exceptional Children, 1961, 27, 429-435.

Lambert, N. M. and Bower, E. M. Bower's two-step process for identifying emotionally handicapped pupils. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1961.

McCandless, B. R. and McDavid, J. Psychological theory, research, and juvenile delinquency. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1962, 53, 1-14.

McDavid, J. Social psychology. New York: Harper and Row, 1968, 1974.

Meninger, K. The crime of punishment. New York: Viking Press, 1968.

Norwicki, J. S. and Strickland, B. R. A locus of control scale for children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 1-8.

Paul, G. L. Insight vs. desensitization in psychotherapy. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Reckless, W. C., Denitz, S., and Kay, B. The self-component in potential delinquency and potential nondelinquency. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 566-570.

Reise, M. W. A comparison between delinquent youth and typical individuals on the ego ideal and conscience development test. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1969.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).

Sabatino, D., Mauser, A., and Skok, J. A survey of institutional educational programs for delinquents in the United States. Paper read at Annual Neglected/Delinquent Conference of Pen lvania: Pocono Manor, Pennsylvania. June, 1975.

Shore, M. F., Massimo, J. L., and Ricks, D. F. A factor analytic study of psychotherapeutic change in delinquent boys. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1965, 21, 208-212.

Stodgill, R. M. Behavior cards: A test interview for delinquent children. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1949.

Thorpe, L. P., Clark, W. W., and Tiegs, E. W. California test of personality. Monterey, California: California Test Bureau, 1953.

Ullman, P. and Krasner, L. (Eds.) Case studies in behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

Voss, H. The predictive efficiency of the Gluecks' Social Prediction Table. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1963, 54, 421-430.

W gner, E. The hand test. Akron, Ohio: Mark James Co., 1959.

Wagner, E. Application of the hand test indicators of antisocial action tendencies in adults to teenage juvenile delinquency. Paper read at the Educational Psychology Association, April 1962.

Whelan, R. W. An experiment in predictive delinquency. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1954, 45, 432-441.

TESTS AND PUBLISHERS

Behavior Cards: A Test Interview for Delinquent Children. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Bender-Gestalt Test. Western Psychological Services, Los Angeles, California.

Bower's Two-Step Process for Identifying Emotionally Handicapped Pupils. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

The California Life Goals' Evaluation Schedules. Western Psychological Services, Los Angeles, California.

California Psychological Inventory. Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., Palo Alto, California.

California Test of Personality. Test Bureau, Monterey, California.

Comprehension Tests of Basic Skills. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.

The Cornell Critical Thinking Test. Critical Thinking Project, Urbana, Illinois.

Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration. Follett Educational Corporation, Chicago, Illinois.

Durrell Listening-Reading Series. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., New York.

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Ego Ideal and Conscience Development Test. Monitor, Hollywood, California.

Gates-McKillop Reading Diagnostic Test. Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Hand Test. Mark James Company, Akron, Ohio.

The Hand Test: A New Projective Test with Special Reference to the Prediction of Overt Aggressive Behavior. Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois.

Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability. Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, Massachusetts.

Hostility and Direction of Hostility Questionnaire. University of London Press, Ltd., London, England.

Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Iowa Education Bureau, Ames, Iowa.

Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1958.

Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test. American Guidance Services, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Kohs Block Design Tests. C. H. Sterling Co., Chicago, Illinois.

Kuder General Interest Survey. Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago, Illinois.

Kuder Occupational Interest Survey. Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago, Illinois.

Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Rating Scale and Checklist. World Book Company, New York.

Leighter International Performance Scale. C. W. Stoelting, Chicago, Illinois.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests. 1931.

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., New York.

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. American Guidance Service, Inc., Circle Pines, Minnesota.

The Porters Maze Test. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Progressive Matrices. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Rorschach InkBlot Test. Greene and Stratton, Inc., New York.

The Rutgers Drawing Test. Anna Spiesman Starr, Highland Park, New Jersey.

Scale for Evaluating the School Behavior of Children, Ten to Fifteen. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Slossen Intelligence Test. Slossen Educational Publications, East Aurora, New York.

SRA Achievement Series: Work-Study Skills. Scientific Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois.

Stanford Achievement Test. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., New York.

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale. Third Review. Houghton-Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts.

Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Men. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Women. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Study Skills Test. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.

Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scales. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1949, Vol. 16.

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Counselor Recordings and Tests, Nashville, Tennessee.

Test of Social Intelligence. Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc., Beverly Hills, California.

Thematic Apperception Test. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Thorndike Dimensions of Temperament. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. Psychological Corporation, New York.

Wide Range Achievement Test. Guidance Associates, Austin, Texas.

Woodcock Reading Mastery Diagnostic Test. American Guidance Services, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT YOUTH: DEMOGRAPHIC FINDINGS	1
Introduction	1
Who Are Neglected and Delinquent Youth?	2
Social Maladjustment	6
Social-Emotional Maladjustment	8
Types of Social Maladjustment	12
The Withdrawal-Aggression Continuum	15
Juvenile Delinquency	17
Important Considerations in Delinquency	27
Sex	27
Age	28
Social Class	28
The Family as the Primary Social "Subculture"	29
Incidence of Social Maladjustment	31
Social Maladjustment and Other Handicaps	53
Recidivism	65
Treatment Relevance	67
Individual Counseling	70
Group Counseling	72
Milieu Therapy	73
Pre-Release Programs	74
References	77
CHAPTER II PSYCHOSOCIAL/EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS	85
Introduction	85
Problems in the Prediction of Delinquency	90
Assessment Instrumentation for Predicting Delinquency	97
Gluecks' Social Prediction Scale	97
Validation of Prediction Efforts	100
The Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Checklist and Rating Scale	103
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory	106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER II (continued)

Variables in Psychosocial/Educational Assessment 109
Intellectual Capacity 109
Medical and Neurological Evaluation. 112
Language Development 114
Diagnosis of Reading Skills 116
Diagnosis of Mathematical Computation 118
Diagnosis of Spelling Ability. 120
Academic Achievement Levels 121
Study and Organizational Skills Evaluation 124
Personality Assessment 126
California Psychological Inventory 129
The California Life Goals Evaluation Schedules 131
The California Test of Personality: A Profile of Personal and Social Adjustment. 132
A Two-Step Process for Identifying Emotionally Handicapped Pupils 133
The Ego Ideal and Conscience Development Test (EICDT) 135
Behavior Cards: A Test Interview for Delinquent Children 136
The Hostility and Direction of Hostility Questionnaire (HDHQ) 137
The Hand Test 138
Self-Concept. 140
Vocational Interest Pattern Assessment 142
Summary 146
References 147

CHAPTER III READING THEORY AND RESEARCH AND CHRONICALLY DISRUPTIVE YOUTH . . . 155

Introduction 155
Theories and Models of Reading 158
Taxonomic Models 161
Psychometric Models 161
Psychological Models 162
Linguistic Models 171
Transactional Models 176

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
CHAPTER III (continued)	
Correlates of Success and Failure in Reading	178
Intelligence Quotient and Mental Age	179
Socioeconomic Factors	184
Background Experience	185
Level of Motivation	186
Language	187
Reading as a Sensory Process	188
Reading and Vision	189
Reading and Hearing	193
Assessing and Evaluating Reading Growth of Chronically Disruptive Youth	195
Standardized Reading Achievement Tests	197
Individual Reading Tests--Oral and Silent	201
Informal Reading Inventories	203
The Cloze Method of Diagnosing Comprehension	205
Measuring Attitudes	206
Criterion Referenced Testing for Functional Literacy	209
Individualizing Reading and Learning Environments for Chronically Disruptive Youth	212
Retarded Reader	213
Disabled Reader	214
Reluctant Reader	214
Experiences - Past and Present	215
Differences Within the Student Influencing Placement	217
The Regular Classroom and Mainstreaming	220
The Special Class	221
The Special School - Public and Private	222
Diagnostic Curriculum Development Centers	223
The Resource Room and Variations	224
Non-Categorical Resource Room	225
Other Techniques	226
Concluding Statement	227
References	228

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER IV MATHEMATICAL PROGRAMMING FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH 237

Overview of Academic Characteristics 237
Programming Models for Delinquent Youth 241
Dimensions of an Academic Program 244
Flexibility 244
Relevancy 245
Diagnostic/Prescriptive Format 245
Concept and Skill Emphasis 246
Enhancement of Social Skills 246
Independent of Management Procedure 246
Content Components of a Mathematics Program for Delinquent Youth 247
Interfacing Content with Dimensions 247
Diagnosis 250
Fountain Valley Teacher Support System in Mathematics . . . 253
Prescriptive Materials Retrieval System 256
Key Math 258
Evaluation 259
Validity 260
Pattern Recognition Skills Inventory (PRSI) 260
Verbal Problem Solving. 262
Math Labs. 267
Essential Components of Math Laboratories 268

References 275

CHAPTER V VOCATIONAL PROGRAMMING FOR CHRONICALLY DISRUPTIVE YOUTH . . . 277

Introduction 277
Curriculum Evaluation 280
Program Studies 284
Training and Instructional Preparation 285
Learning Characteristics 287
Management Procedures 288
Behavioral Approach. 289
Program Development 294

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER V (continued)

Prevocational and Vocational Preparation 296
Personalized Vocational Cluster Development 297
Programming Steps 299
Vocational Development Center 301
Diagnostic Procedures 302
Environmental Assessment 303
Ancillary Assessment 304
Curriculum 307
Management Tactics 307
Performance Contracting 310
Token Economy 311
Model Program 312
Conclusions 315

References 317

CHAPTER VI BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION WITH DISRUPTIVE, DELINQUENT, AND OTHERWISE DEVIANT ADOLESCENTS . . 326

Deviant Personality 327
Behavioral View of Deviance 329
Acquisition 329
Maintenance 331
Behavior Modification Assumptions 333
Observable Phenomena 334
Target Assessment 337
Effectiveness Verification 338
Multiple-Baseline Design 339
Reversal Design 346
Behavior Modification Procedures 351
Regulating Performance 352
Strengthening Behavior 352
Weakening Behavior 356
Promoting Acquisition 359

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER VI (continued)

Composite Behavior Modification Techniques 362
Behavioral Contracting 362
Token Economies 370
Reinforced Modeling 379
Concluding Remarks 385

References 387

CHAPTER VII A REVIEW OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE AMONG CHILDREN AND YOUTH. . 393

Introduction 393
Learning Theory Approach 396
Positive Reinforcement 397
Negative Reinforcement 399
The Way Drugs Are Used 400
Experimental User 400
Recreational User 401
Compulsive Abuser 402
Societal Conditions Which Encourage Drug Consumption . . . 402
Summary of Motivational Factors 404
Drug Addiction and Dependency 406
Classification of Drugs 409
Intensifiers 409
Desensitizers 411
LSD 413
Marijuana and Hashish 417
Amphetamines 423
Alcohol 426
Barbiturates 430
Heroin 433
Rehabilitation 436
Summary 438

References 439

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER VIII PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT OF DISRUPTIVE YOUTH 442

Introduction 442
Client-Centered Therapies 443
Reality Therapy 446
Comprehensive Vocationally Oriented Psychotherapy . . . 447
Adlerian Approach 449
Milieu-Oriented Therapies 452
Community Adjustment 453
Educational Adjustment 459
The Psychoeducational Model 460
Catch-Up Program 463
The Social Competence Model 465
The Bryant Youth Educational Support Center (YES) 470
The DuPage Study 471
Off-Campus Learning Center 472
Generalized Student Profile 474
The Instructor's Role 476
Objectives 478
Evaluation 482
The General Studies Program (GSP) 483
Program Design 487
Summary 490

References 494

CHAPTER IX ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT OF INSTITUTIONS AND CENTERS FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH 497

Introduction 497
The Development of Institutions 500
Current State of the Art 512
Essential Aspects of Administration 523
Current Trends 523
Planned Change 526
Dynamics of Administration 529
Decision Making 536
The Process of Decision Making 537

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER IX (continued)

Institutional Program Models 538
Formal Organization 539
Types of Formal Organization 540
Systems Analysis 546
Evaluation 555
Goals and Objectives 559
Program Evaluation 563
Evaluation Design 564
Performance Appraisal of Personnel 566
A Simplistic Program Evaluation Process 568
A Practical Evaluation Design 571
Pre-Situational Stage 571
Situational Stage 572
Post-Situational Stage 573
The Institutional Administrator 576

References 597

CHAPTER X PREVENTION, PUNISHMENT, AND REHABILITATION 608

Introduction 608
Differentiating Correctional Typologies 609
Punishment 614
Prevention 620
Primary Prevention: A Responsibility of the Schools 623
Early Identification and Early Prevention 625
An Instructional Approach 625
The Surface Versus the Causal Approach of the Teacher to Child Behavior 628
An Elementary School Preventative Effort 629
A Secondary-School Preventative Effort 632
Vocational Preparation as Prevention 635
Special Summer Programs 638
Community-Based Prevention 642
Other Preventative Efforts 645

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
CHAPTER X (continued)	
Assumptions	648
Guiding Principles	648
Participants	649
Organization and Program: Youth Council	650
Summary of Prevention Activities	655
The Cambridge-Somerville Project	656
New York City Youth Board	656
Maximum Benefits Project	657
Midcity Project	657
Youth Consultation Service	657
Rehabilitation	661
Institutionalization as a Treatment Measure	664
Vocationally Oriented Institutional Programs	671
Community Treatment: Alternative Plans to Institutionalization	675
State of the "Rehabilitation" Act in Correctional Education	681
Community Rehabilitation and the Schools	685
References	691

TABLE OF FIGURES

Page

CHAPTER I:

Figure 1 Psychosocial Adaptation 11

CHAPTER IV:

Figure 1 Interactive Unit Model. 249

Figure 2 Example of Criterion-Referencing 254

Figure 3 UPS Matrix for Indirect Verbal Problems . 266

CHAPTER V:

Figure 1 Integrated Vocational Program 305

Figure 2 Model Program 314

CHAPTER VI:

Figure 1 Graphic Chart - Six Days 341

Figure 2 Graphic Chart - Thirteen Days 343

Figure 3 Graphic Chart - Twenty-Two Days . . . 344

Figure 4 Graphic Chart - Thirty Days. 345

Figure 5 Graphic Chart - Tardies - Seven Days . 348

Figure 6 Graphic Chart - Tardies - Thirty-Five Days 350

Figure 7 Contracting - Daily Attendance Record Chart 368

Figure 8 Behavioral Contract Sample 369

TABLE OF FIGURES

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER VIII:

Figure 1 Ecological System of a Child 467

CHAPTER IX:

Figure 1 Special Education Programs 510

Figure 2 Getzels' and Guba's Description of Educational Administration as a Social Process. 522

Figure 3 Model of Adult Basic Education in Corrections 554

Figure 4 Evaluation Process 569

Figure 5 Evaluation Worksheet 575

TABLE OF TABLES

		Page
CHAPTER I:		
Table 1	Behavior Problems Shown by One-Third or More of the Boys and Girls at Each Age Level	33
Table 2	The Prevalence of Some Behavior Characteristics in a Weighted Representative Sample of 482 Children Aged 6 to 12 as Reported by Their Mothers	37
Table 3	Delinquency Rates (1960) by Sex, Race, and Age	39
Table 4	Juvenile Court Delinquency Rates (1960) by Sex, Race, and Income	41
Table 5	Juvenile Court Delinquency Rates (1960) by Sex, Race, and Number of Parents in the Home	42
Table 6	Breakdown, by Category, of Nonviolent Crimes Committed by Youth	48
Table 7	Length of Recorded Criminal Activity in Relation to Offender's Age	49
Table 8	Age of the Offenders on Sentence to Borstal Shown According to Age at First Conviction	50
Table 9	Type of Current Offense Shown According to the Number of Criminal Associates	51
Table 10	Distribution of Offenders According to Degree of Previous Recidivism and Type of Current Offense	52
Table 11	Movements of Patients from Ward Before and After Inception of Program	64

TABLE OF TABLES

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER V:

Table 1 Curriculum Content Areas 308

CHAPTER VIII:

Table 1 A Comparison Among the Proponents of the Major Therapeutic Approaches on Selected Dimensions 444

Table 2 How to Correct Childrens' Misbehaviour . . 451

Table 3 Schedule of Classes 458

Table 4 The Self-Control Curriculum: Overview of Curriculum Areas and Units 492

CHAPTER IX:

Table 1 Planned Change Model 528

Table 2 Table of Organization - Type 1 541

Table 3 Table of Organization - Type 2 542

Table 4 Table of Organization - Type 3 545

TABLE OF TABLES

(continued)

Page

CHAPTER X:

Table 1 Completed Delinquency Prevention Experiments, 1937-1965 658

Table 2 Job History and Legal Status on Five-Year Followup (Experimental Group) 673

Table 3 Job History and Legal Status on Five-Year Followup (Control Group). 674